



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/586,955

07/25/2006

Yoshinobu Watanabe

10873.1897USWO

3465

53148

7590

09/25/2008

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON P.C.

P.O. BOX 2902-0902

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

DASGUPTA, SOUMYA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/586,955	Applicant(s) WATANABE ET AL.	
	Examiner SOUMYA DASGUPTA	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Applicant's Response

In the applicant's response for application 10/586,955 dated 6/13/2008, the applicant amended Claims 1 and 5-9; and cancelled Claims 2-4; and argued against all the rejections and objections.

The rejections under 35 USC 101 for Claims 1-17 are withdrawn because the amended claims now recite statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-9, as originally filed, are currently pending and have been considered below.

Claims 1, 6, and 8 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 2176

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano et al (US 2004/0254465; Patent Issue Date: Dec 16, 2004; Patent Filing Date: Nov 22, 2001; hereafter Sano) in view of Buxton et al (US 6,094,197; Patent Issue Date: Jul 25, 2000; Patent Filing Date: Dec May 17, 1995; hereafter Buxton).

Claim 1:

Sano discloses **an ultrasonic diagnosis system comprising: an ultrasonic detecting portion that transmits an ultrasonic wave to a subject and receives a reflected wave therefrom;** (Abstract → Sano discloses an ultrasonic diagnostic equipment that which projects ultrasonic signals into a patient, and which generates an ultrasonic image on the basis of reflection echoes within the patient. It is well known in the art that ultrasound machines have mechanisms used for " detecting portion that transmits an ultrasonic wave to a subject and receives a reflected wave therefrom.")

an image display portion that has a diagnostic image display region for displaying a diagnostic image based on an image signal from the ultrasonic detecting portion and displays a setting button and a cursor of a pointing device for making a selection of a setting condition; (Abstract → Sano discloses “an image display portion that has a diagnostic image display region for displaying a diagnostic image based on an image signal from the ultrasonic detecting portion” in that the workflow system controls the equipment operations including generation of the

Art Unit: 2176

ultrasonic image. Fig 3 → Sano discloses “displays a setting button and a cursor of a pointing device for making a selection of a setting condition” in that user can select settings for the diagnostic system on a menu.)

and a control portion that has a function of setting the setting condition based on the selection of the setting condition; (Fig 3 → Sano discloses “function of setting the setting condition based on the selection of the setting condition” in that user can select settings for the diagnostic system on a menu.)

wherein the ultrasonic diagnosis system has a function in which a pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor on the setting button, (Figs 12 (A-C) → Sano discloses “function in which a pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor on the setting button” in that the user can use the pop-up menu to select functions by using a cursor.)

and a function in which an alternative in the pop-up menu is selected by locating the cursor on the alternative (Figs 12 (A-C) → Sano discloses “a function in which an alternative in the pop-up menu is selected by locating the cursor on the alternative” in that the user has choices of selection to choose from on the pop-up menu. The examiner interprets “alternative” to mean selections on the pop-up menu.)

Sano does not appear to explicitly disclose **the alternative that is selected last is confirmed by moving the cursor to a region outside the pop-up menu.**

Art Unit: 2176

Buxton discloses **the alternative that is selected last is confirmed by moving the cursor to a region outside the pop-up menu.** (Figs 2-5 → Buxton discloses “the alternative that is selected last is confirmed by moving the cursor to a region outside the pop-up menu” in that the icons are able to be selected and formatted when the cursor moves in a certain direction away from the selection.)

Sano and Buxton are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of selecting icons.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sano and Buxton before him or her, to incorporate ultrasonic diagnostic equipment with selectable menu options, as disclosed by Sano, with a directional proximity selector, as disclosed by Buxton .

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to select an icon without clicking on it.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Buxton with Sano to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 6:

Sano discloses **an ultrasonic diagnosis system comprising: an ultrasonic detecting portion that transmits an ultrasonic wave to a subject and receives a reflected wave therefrom;** (Abstract → Sano discloses an ultrasonic diagnostic equipment that which projects ultrasonic signals into a patient, and which generates an

Art Unit: 2176

ultrasonic image on the basis of reflection echoes within the patient. It is well known in the art that ultrasound machines have mechanisms used for "detecting portion that transmits an ultrasonic wave to a subject and receives a reflected wave therefrom.")

an image display portion that has a diagnostic image display region for displaying a diagnostic image based on an image signal from the ultrasonic detecting portion and displays a setting button and a cursor of a pointing device for making a selection of a setting condition; (Abstract → Sano discloses "an image display portion that has a diagnostic image display region for displaying a diagnostic image based on an image signal from the ultrasonic detecting portion" in that the workflow system controls the equipment operations including generation of the ultrasonic image. Fig 3 → Sano discloses "displays a setting button and a cursor of a pointing device for making a selection of a setting condition" in that user can select settings for the diagnostic system on a menu.)

and a control portion that has a function of setting the setting condition based on the selection of the setting condition; (Fig 3 → Sano discloses "function of setting the setting condition based on the selection of the setting condition" in that user can select settings for the diagnostic system on a menu.)

Art Unit: 2176

wherein the ultrasonic diagnosis system has a function in which a pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor on the setting button, (Figs 12 (A-C) → Sano discloses “function in which a pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor on the setting button” in that the user can use the pop-up menu to select functions by using a cursor.)

and a function in which an alternative in the pop-up menu is selected by locating the cursor on the alternative (Figs 12 (A-C) → Sano discloses “a function in which an alternative in the pop-up menu is selected by locating the cursor on the alternative” in that the user has choices of selection to choose from on the pop-up menu. The examiner interprets “alternative” to mean selections on the pop-up menu.)

Sano does not appear to explicitly disclose **the alternative that is selected last is confirmed by moving the cursor rightward, leftward, horizontally, upward, downward or vertically in the selected alternative in the pop-up menu.**

Buxton discloses **the alternative that is selected last is confirmed by moving the cursor rightward, leftward, horizontally, upward, downward or vertically in the selected alternative in the pop-up menu.** (Figs 2-5 → Buxton discloses “the alternative that is selected last is confirmed by moving the cursor rightward, leftward, horizontally, upward, downward or vertically in the selected alternative in the pop-up

Art Unit: 2176

menu” in that the icons are selected and formatted when the cursor moves in different directions.)

Sano and Buxton are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of selecting icons.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sano and Buxton before him or her, to incorporate ultrasonic diagnostic equipment with selectable menu options, as disclosed by Sano, with a directional proximity selector, as disclosed by Buxton .

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to select an icon without clicking on it.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Buxton with Sano to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano et al (US 2004/0254465; Patent Issue Date: Dec 16, 2004; Patent Filing Date: Nov 22, 2001; hereafter Sano) in view of Alexander (US 6,049,325; Patent Issue Date: Apr 11, 2000; hereafter Alexander).

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 8:

Sano discloses **an ultrasonic diagnosis system comprising: an ultrasonic detecting portion that transmits an ultrasonic wave to a subject and receives a reflected wave therefrom;** (Abstract → Sano discloses an ultrasonic diagnostic equipment that which projects ultrasonic signals into a patient, and which generates an ultrasonic image on the basis of reflection echoes within the patient. It is well known in the art that ultrasound machines have mechanisms used for "detecting portion that transmits an ultrasonic wave to a subject and receives a reflected wave therefrom.")

an image display portion that has a diagnostic image display region for displaying a diagnostic image based on an image signal from the ultrasonic detecting portion and displays a setting button and a cursor of a pointing device for making a selection of a setting condition; (Abstract → Sano discloses "an image display portion that has a diagnostic image display region for displaying a diagnostic image based on an image signal from the ultrasonic detecting portion" in that the workflow system controls the equipment operations including generation of the ultrasonic image. Fig 3 → Sano discloses "displays a setting button and a cursor of a pointing device for making a selection of a setting condition" in that user can select settings for the diagnostic system on a menu.)

Art Unit: 2176

and a control portion that has a function of setting the setting condition based on the selection of the setting condition; (Fig 3 → Sano discloses “function of setting the setting condition based on the selection of the setting condition” in that user can select settings for the diagnostic system on a menu.)

wherein the ultrasonic diagnosis system has a function in which a pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor on the setting button, (Figs 12 (A-C) → Sano discloses “function in which a pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor on the setting button” in that the user can use the pop-up menu to select functions by using a cursor.)

and a function in which an alternative in the pop-up menu is selected by locating the cursor on the alternative (Figs 12 (A-C) → Sano discloses “a function in which an alternative in the pop-up menu is selected by locating the cursor on the alternative” in that the user has choices of selection to choose from on the pop-up menu. The examiner interprets “alternative” to mean selections on the pop-up menu.)

Sano does not appear to explicitly disclose **the alternative that is selected last is confirmed by keeping the cursor in the selected alternative for a certain period of time.**

Art Unit: 2176

Alexander discloses **the alternative that is selected last is confirmed by keeping the cursor in the selected alternative for a certain period of time.** (Col 3, lines 9-15 →

Alexander discloses “the alternative that is selected last is confirmed by keeping the cursor in the selected alternative for a certain period of time” in that the dwell time is used for selection of an icon by cursor.)

Sano and Alexander are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of selecting icons.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sano and Alexander before him or her, to incorporate ultrasonic diagnostic equipment with selectable menu options, as disclosed by Sano, with a dwell time selector, as disclosed by Alexander.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to select an icon without clicking on it.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Alexander with Sano to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 9:

Sano discloses the limitations of Claim 8.

Sano also discloses selection of items in a pop-up menu (Figs 12 (A-C))

Art Unit: 2176

Sano does not appear to explicitly disclose **the ultrasonic diagnosis system which has a function of setting a time period until the pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor of the pointing device on the setting button drawn on a screen.**

Alexander discloses **the ultrasonic diagnosis system which has a function of setting a time period until the pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor of the pointing device on the setting button drawn on a screen.** (Col 3, lines 9-15 →

Alexander discloses “a function of setting a time period until the pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor of the pointing device on the setting button drawn on a screen” in that the dwell time is used for selection of an icon by cursor.)

Sano and Alexander are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of selecting icons.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sano and Alexander before him or her, to incorporate ultrasonic diagnostic equipment with selectable menu options, as disclosed by Sano, with a dwell time selector, as disclosed by Alexander.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to select an icon without clicking on it.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Alexander with Sano to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Art Unit: 2176

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano et al (US 2004/0254465; Patent Issue Date: Dec 16, 2004; Patent Filing Date: Nov 22, 2001; hereafter Sano) in view of Buxton et al (US 6,094,197; Patent Issue Date: Jul 25, 2000; Patent Filing Date: Dec May 17, 1995; hereafter Buxton) in further view of Alexander (US 6,049,325; Patent Issue Date: Apr 11, 2000; hereafter Alexander).

Claim 5:

Sano discloses the limitations of Claim 8.

Sano also discloses selection of items in a pop-up menu. (Figs 12 (A-C)).

Buxton discloses directional proximity selecting mechanisms. (Figs 2-5)

Sano and Buxton do not appear to explicitly disclose **the ultrasonic diagnosis system which has a function of setting a time period until the pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor of the pointing device on the setting button drawn on a screen.**

Alexander discloses **the ultrasonic diagnosis system which has a function of setting a time period until the pop-up menu opens by locating the cursor of the pointing device on the setting button drawn on a screen.** (Col 3, lines 9-15 →

Alexander discloses “a function of setting a time period until the pop-up menu opens by

Art Unit: 2176

locating the cursor of the pointing device on the setting button drawn on a screen” in that the dwell time is used for selection of an icon by cursor.)

Sano, Buxton, and Alexander are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of selecting icons.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sano, Buxton, and Alexander before him or her, to incorporate ultrasonic diagnostic equipment with selectable menu options, as disclosed by Sano, with a directional proximity selection mechanism, as disclosed by Buxton, and with a dwell time selector, as disclosed by Alexander.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to select an icon without clicking on it.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Alexander and Buxton with Sano to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 7:

Claim 7 corresponds to Claim 5.

Response to Arguments

Claims (1 and 6) Rejection under 35 USC ~ 103(a):

For Claims 1 and 6, the applicant argues that Dutta does not disclose "selection by moving the cursor to a region outside of the pop-up menu", as recited in Claim 1, and "selection by moving the cursor rightward, leftward, horizontally, upward, etc in the

Art Unit: 2176

selected alternative in the pop-up menu," as recited in Claim 6. Applicant's arguments, see pages 6-8, filed 6/18/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 and 6 under Sano et al (US 2004/0254465) in view of Dutta et al (US 6,717,600) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of under Sano et al (US 2004/0254465) in view of Buxton et al (US 6,094,197).

Claims (5 and 7) Rejection under 35 USC ~ 103(a):

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected due to their dependency on Claims 1 and 6 respectively.

Claims (8 and 9) Rejection under 35 USC ~ 103(a):

For Claim 8, the applicant argues that Alexander (US 6,049,325) does not disclose "confirmed by keeping the cursor in the selected alternative for a certain period of time" and is not functionally equivalent to dwell-time selection, as featured in Alexander.

The examiner disagrees.

Alexander discloses "confirmed by keeping the cursor in the selected alternative for a certain period of time" in that the system includes a dwell-time selection feature. Dwell-time selection is when the cursor selects an object or icon after a period of an elapsed without the user clicking on the item. The applicant's argument of hindsight is

Art Unit: 2176

superfluous and erroneous because the dwell time selection feature is well-known in the art. Please see attached reference entitled "Command Without a Click: Dwell Time Typing by Mouse and Gaze Selection."

Claim 9 is rejected due to its dependency on Claim 8.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SOUMYA DASGUPTA whose telephone number is (571)272-7432. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9am-7pm, F 9am-1pm.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SD

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100